

Statement of the Case.

a carrying forward of an old idea, a result, perhaps, somewhat more perfect than had theretofore been attained, but not rising to the dignity of invention. We have repeatedly held patents of this description to be invalid. *Stimpson v. Woodman*, 10 Wall. 117; *Smith v. Nichols*, 21 Wall. 112; *Guidet v. Brooklyn*, 105 U. S. 550; *Hall v. Macneale*, 107 U. S. 90.

The decree of the court below dismissing the bill is, therefore,

Affirmed.

WRIGHT v. BEGGS. Appeal from the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. No. 2, argued with No. 1. Decided October 22, 1894. MR. JUSTICE BROWN delivered the opinion of the court. This was a suit against the defendant Beggs as maker of the engine used by Yuengling, and is disposed of by the opinion in the last case holding the Wright patent to be invalid. The decree of the court below dismissing the bill is, therefore,

Affirmed.

Mr. Andrew M. Todd for appellant.

Mr. B. F. Lee for appellee.

LEWIS v. PIMA COUNTY.

APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF THE TERRITORY OF ARIZONA.

No. 550. Submitted October 17, 1894. — Decided October 29, 1894.

The act of the legislature of Arizona of February 21, 1883, authorizing Pima County in that Territory to issue its bonds in aid of the construction of a railway, is a violation of the restrictions imposed upon territorial legislatures by Rev. Stat. § 1889, as amended by the act of June 8, 1878, c. 168, and the bonds issued under the authority assumed to be conferred by that statute created no obligation against the county which a court of law can enforce.

THIS was an action originally begun in the District Court of the First Judicial District of Arizona upon 2250 coupons